DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 422 999 JC 980 393

AUTHOR	Taffy, Fred
TITLE	A Survey of Assessment Activities at Hudson County Community College.
INSTITUTION	Hudson County Community Coll., Jersey City, NJ. Office of Planning and Institutional Research.
PUB DATE	1998-02-05
NOTE	20p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Accountability; *Community Colleges; Data Collection; Educational Assessment; Educational Research; *Evaluation Methods; Institutional Mission; *Institutional Research; Surveys; Test Reviews; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Hudson County Community College NJ

ABSTRACT

This report emphasizes the importance of two types of assessment: (1) authentic assessment, which encompasses a holistic or comprehensive view of student performance, and (2) assessment of institutional effectiveness, or outcomes assessment, which is a process of measuring how effectively a college executes its stated mission. While Hudson County Community College has not recently engaged in a formal program of ongoing institutional assessment, it has conducted a number of studies, including the most recent college-wide review, discussed in the document "A Comprehensive Self-Study." As a result of this self study, one of the recommendations set forth for the college was to develop a plan for ongoing institutional assessment. In the 1997-98 academic year, three key elements of the self-study recommendation were implemented: (1) the position of assessment analyst, responsible for coordinating program and service area reviews, was created and filled; (2) a schedule of programs and service areas to be reviewed was developed; and (3) a guide for program and service area review was developed. Included are tables of faculty profiles and comparisons of classroom assessment instruments used. Appended are comments made by administrators and faculty, and a copy of the Classroom Assessment Activities Survey. (AS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 422 999

HUDSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Office of Planning and Institutional Research
25 Journal Square, Room 317
Jersey City, New Jersey 07306
(201) 714-2113
Fax (201) 714-7148

A Survey of Assessment Activities at Hudson County Community College

Fred Taffy
Report 98.01AR
February 5, 1998

Mark Oromaner, Dean of Planning and Institutional Research
Fred Taffy, Assessment Analyst
Emma Lopez, Secretary to the Dean

JC 980 393

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Taffy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Survey of Assessment Activities at
Hudson County Community College

Background

Prior to the 1980s--in primary, secondary, and higher education--the major ways to measure student performance were tests that teachers made and gave to students and standardized tests that teachers administered, but did not develop. In return, students received report cards, transcripts, or test scores. And within education, students were pretty much the only ones to be tested. Teachers were observed on occasion and more frequently when they were being considered for tenure. Schools, programs, and administrative offices were assumed to be doing their jobs; their only period of "testing" took place during state licensure or regional accreditation self-studies and visits--usually once every five or ten years.

In 1983 a national committee produced A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. This landmark report, which proposed a renewed emphasis on excellence in all levels of education, called for a review of student assessment. Additionally, over the past fifteen years the concept of accountability in education has been raised by the public, by legislators and other government leaders, by educators, by employers, and by students. These developments have emphasized the importance of two new concepts. The first is authentic assessment, also called classroom assessment techniques. The second is assessment of institutional effectiveness, sometimes called outcomes assessment. Both types of assessment share common goals:

1. To improve student learning.
2. To provide data that lets a college community and its other stakeholders know how well an institution and its faculty are accomplishing their mission and goals.

The two types of assessment are defined on the next page.

Authentic Assessment	Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness
Authentic assessment encompasses a more holistic or comprehensive view of student performance. Because the assessment takes the student's "whole" performance into account, it is considered more authentic than an objective test that might provide a limited measurement of learning. Many teachers use authentic assessment when they incorporate student participation, writing tasks, and other activities when evaluating student learning. A key goal of authentic assessment is to provide students with varied opportunities to demonstrate learning. Accordingly, it is the demonstration of learning that is of prime importance, not how the learning is demonstrated.	**Assessment of institutional effectiveness is a process of measuring how effectively a college lives its stated mission. It moves beyond the traditional self-studies, which are usually static and view the institution at a specific time, to become an ongoing process whereby divisions, departments, academic programs, and other areas of the institution are studied on a cyclical basis. And, while the traditional concept of institutional assessment assumes evaluation by individuals and organizations external to the school, under assessment of institutional effectiveness, responsibility for assessment rests with members of the college community, particularly those whose areas are being studied.**

Assessment at Hudson County Community College

While HCCC has not recently engaged in a formal program of ongoing institutional assessment (also called cyclical review of programs and service areas), it has conducted and called for a number of studies[1]. These include the most recent collegewide review as documented in A Comprehensive Self-Study (September 1997), which was prepared for the college's Middle States accreditation visit in fall of 1997. Divisional and departmental reviews have also been conducted. In spring 1997 an outside consulting team conducted a study of the college's Division of Student Affairs. Academic programs; e.g., Culinary Arts and Medical Assisting, have undergone self-studies leading to external accreditation. English as a Second Language and Basic Skills offerings have also been reviewed.

In A Comprehensive Self-Study the college recognized, however, that such studies were not sufficient to measure how effectively HCCC fulfills its mission. As a result of the self-study process, one of the recommendations set forth was for the college to develop a plan for ongoing institutional assessment.

---

[1]Cyclical review processes were in place during the 1982-91 period.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Although the college community as a whole is to be involved in the process of assessment, coordination of this process resides within the Division of Planning and Institutional Research, which is the generally accepted practice in community colleges in New Jersey and around the country. In the 1997/1998 academic year three key elements of the Self-Study recommendation were implemented:

1. The position of assessment analyst, responsible for coordinating program and service area reviews, was created and filled within the Division of Planning and Institutional Research.
2. A schedule of programs and service areas to be reviewed was developed, with the first programs--accounting and data processing--set for review in spring of 1998.
3. A guide for program and service area review was developed.

Before initiating HCCC's new self-study process, the Dean of Planning and Institutional Research called for a survey of faculty and academic administrators to determine what instruments (methods) were currently being used to assess student learning and program effectiveness. In November and December of 1997, two waves of "Survey: Classroom Assessment Activities" and "Survey: Current Program and Service Area Assessment Activities" (see Appendix, pages 15-18, for survey copies) were sent to faculty and academic administrators respectively. In each wave, 313 "Classroom Assessment" surveys were sent to faculty (249 adjunct and 64 full-time)[2], and 18 "Program and Service Area" surveys were sent to academic administrators.

Classroom Assessment

Total responses to the "Classroom Assessment" survey were 105 or 34% of the total sent out. Of the 64 full-time faculty surveys, response was 41% (n=26). Of the 249 surveys sent to adjuncts, response was 32% (n=79). Faculty were asked to indicate assessment instruments used (discussion to follow) and to provide selected job profile data (Table 1).

---

[2] Full-time faculty included 15 temporary full-time instructors.

Table 1--Faculty Profile						
Category	**Full-Time (n=26)**		**Adjunct (n=79)**		**Total (n=105)**	
Total Years Teaching at HCCC						
Under 1-4	10	39%	47	59%	57	54%
5-9	5	19%	18	23%	23	22%
10+	11	42%	11	14%	22	21%
No response	0	0%	3	4%	3	3%
Total Years of College Teaching (including years at HCCC)						
Under 1-4	1	4%	27	34%	28	27%
5-9	6	23%	24	30%	30	29%
10+	18	69%	23	29%	41	39%
No response	1	4%	5	6%	6	6%
Divisional Affiliation						
Business & Allied Health	5	19%	11	14%	16	15%
Culinary Arts	1	4%	1	1%	2	2%
English, Humanities, & Soc. Sci.	8	31%	45	57%	53	50%
English as a Second Language	8	31%	9	11%	17	16%
Mathematics, Science, & Tech.	4	15%	11	14%	15	14%
No response	0	0%	2	3%	2	2%
Gender						
Female	12	46%	28	35%	40	38%
Male	12	46%	40	51%	52	50%
No Response	2	8%	11	14%	13	12%

The job profile data reveal that, in terms of teaching experience, the majority of full-time faculty (42%) have 10 or more years of experience at HCCC. When HCCC background is combined with prior college teaching experience, 69% of full-time faculty have a total of 10 or more years of teaching experience in higher education. While the majority of adjuncts (59%) have less than 1 to 4 years of teaching experience

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

at HCCC, 23% have 5 to 9 years of experience, and 14% have taught at the college for 10 or more years. When HCCC experience is combined with other college teaching, 29% of adjuncts have a total of 10 or more years of teaching background in higher education. In terms of divisional affiliation, the totals for full-time and adjunct faculty provide a fair representation of each division according to size. Gender totals for both categories of faculty are also a fair reflection of actual faculty composition.

Table 2 lists assessment instruments used by HCCC faculty and ranked according to use by number of faculty. Responses indicate that over 50% of faculty are using many of the methods advocated under authentic assessment (items 1-10) to the extent that objective tests/quizzes are ranked at 5th place, with class participation, homework, essay tests, and oral question-and-answer sessions ranking higher. Under a more traditional assessment environment, objective tests/quizzes would rank higher.

Table 2--Classroom Assessment Instruments Used by Faculty

	As Used by Actual # of Faculty	Percent Based on 105 Responses
1. Class participation (i.e., class discussions)	101	96.2%
2. Homework (i.e., text/workbook problems & exercises)	91	86.7%
3. Essay tests	86	81.9%
4. Oral question-and-answer sessions	84	80.0%
5. Objective tests/quizzes (true/false, multiple choice, fill-ins, etc.)	82	78.1%
6. Observations of students working in teams	74	70.5%
7. Oral presentations	73	69.5%
8. Writing journals/writing logs/other writing activities	68	64.8%
9. Research papers	61	58.1%
10. Reviews/critiques/analyses of books and articles	61	58.1%
11. Notebooks	47	44.8%
12. Portfolios	34	32.4%
13. Observations of students using equipment and technology	31	29.5%
14. Lab Reports	19	18.1%
15. Externship/internship on-site evaluations	9	8.6%
16. Other (see Appendix, pages 11 & 12, for a listing of items written in by respondents)		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In addition to being asked to indicate assessment instruments currently used, respondents were asked to note assessment methods that they would use in the future. A comparison of instruments used and instruments that faculty would use reveals little change. Class participation, homework, essay tests, oral question-and-answer sessions, and objective tests/quizzes remain the five most highly ranked instruments faculty use and would use to assess student learning. These are among the most traditional of the instruments listed. By contrast, a number of the more recently employed assessment instruments (e.g., notebooks and portfolios) received relatively low rankings. One indication of interest among faculty in new instruments is the finding that while reviews/critiques/analyses of books and articles was ranked 10th in terms of use, it was ranked 6th in terms of would use. This was the only item to experience a change of more than two positions in the rankings.

Table 3--Rank Order Comparison of Classroom Assessment Instruments Used and Those That Faculty Would Use

	Used:	Would Use:	Rank Difference
Class participation (i.e., class discussions)	1	2	-1
Homework (i.e., text/workbook problems & exercises)	2	3	-1
Essay tests	3	1	2
Oral question-and-answer sessions	4	4	0
Objective tests/quizzes (true/false, multiple choice, fill-ins, etc.)	5	5	0
Observations of students working in teams	6	8	-2
Oral presentations	7	7	0
Writing journals/writing logs/other writing activities	8	10	-2
Research papers	9	9	0
Reviews/critiques/analyses of books and articles	10	6	4
Notebooks	11	12	-1
Portfolios	12	11	1
Observations of students using equipment and technology	13	13	0
Lab Reports	14	15	-1
Externship/internship on-site evaluations	15	14	1
Other (see Appendix, pages 11 & 12, for a listing of items written in by respondents)			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Is there a difference between full-time and adjunct faculty in terms of assessment techniques used? Table 4 indicates that of the 16 methods listed on the survey, both categories of instructors rank 9 of the 16 (56%) equally. In only one of the six remaining items was there a difference of more than 2 ranks. Writing journals/writing logs/other writing activities is ranked 4th by full-time faculty and 8th by adjunct faculty. The 8th place ranking of this item in Tables 2 and 3 is a reflection of the fact that 75% of the total respondents were adjuncts.

Table 4--Rank Order Comparison of Assessment Instruments Used According to Faculty Status

	Full-Time	Adjunct	Rank Difference
Class participation (i.e., class discussions)	1	1	0
Homework (i.e., text/workbook problems & exercises)	2	2	0
Essay tests	3	3	0
Writing journals/writing logs/other writing activities	4	8	-4
Oral question-and-answer sessions	5	4	1
Objective tests/quizzes (true/false, multiple choice, fill-ins, etc.)	6	5	1
Oral presentations	7	7	0
Observations of students working in teams	8	6	2
Research papers	9	10	-1
Reviews/critiques/analyses of books and articles	10	9	1
Notebooks	11	11	0
Portfolios	12	12	0
Observations of students using equipment and technology	13	13	0
Lab Reports	14	14	0
Externship/internship on-site evaluations	15	15	0
Other (see Appendix, pages 11 & 12, for a listing of items written in by respondents)			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program and Service Area Assessment

Of the 18 "Program and Service Area" surveys that were sent to academic administrators, there were 12 responses (67%). These are reflected in Table 5, which ranks program assessment instruments used at HCCC. The two most commonly used types of assessment are student evaluations of faculty and coordinator/peer evaluations of faculty, each used by 92% of administrators for evaluative purposes, a rate far above any other instrument, with the next nearest--advisory committee input--being 58%. The low ranking for some items; e.g., job placement rates and professional certification, is understandable in that those do not apply to all programs.

Table 5--Instruments Used to Assess Program Effectiveness

	As Used by Actual # of Adm'ors	Percent Based on 12 Responses
1. Student evaluations of faculty	11	92%
2. Coordinator/peer evaluations of faculty	11	92%
3. Advisory committee input	7	58%
4. Retention rates	6	50%
5. Surveys of graduates	6	50%
6. External program accreditation	6	50%
7. Employer surveys	5	42%
8. Self-studies (not including accreditation processes as in 6 above)	5	42%
9. Surveys of students	4	33%
10. Exit tests (i.e., College Composition I essay exam)	4	33%
11. Graduation rates	4	33%
12. Transfer to four-year colleges for graduates	4	33%
13. Transfer to four-year colleges for students who have not graduated	4	33%
14. Job placement rates	3	25%
15. Professional certification exams for students	2	17%
16. Capstone courses	1	8%
17. Capstone projects	0	0%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As in the case of faculty, academic administrators were asked to indicate assessment instruments that they would use in addition to those currently being used (Table 6). In contrast to the high degree of agreement in the case of faculty, there was a rank order difference of at least 4 points for 8 of the 17 items ranked by administrators for the assessment of programs. Those instruments for which administrators indicated a significantly stronger desired use measure program effectiveness in terms of end use/product or externalization of review; e.g., surveys of graduates (+4), external program accreditation (+4), graduation rates (+6), and job placement rates (+11). Conversely, those instruments that may be perceived as more process oriented; e.g., student evaluations of faculty (-11) and coordinator/peer evaluations of faculty (-9) experienced a decline in rank. Although exit tests (i.e., College Composition I essay exams) are not generally viewed as process oriented assessments, their effectiveness in evaluation has been questioned by members of this and other college communities, and this may be reflected in their lower ranking (-5).

Table 6--Rank Order Comparison of Instruments Used and Those That Academic Administrators Would Use to Assess Program Effectiveness

	Used	Would Use	Rank Difference
Student evaluations of faculty	1	12	-11
Coordinator/peer evaluations of faculty	2	11	-9
Advisory committee input	3	4	-1
Retention rates	4	8	-4
Surveys of graduates	5	1	4
External program accreditation	6	2	4
Employer surveys	7	7	0
Self-studies (not including accreditation processes as in 6 above)	8	10	-2
Surveys of students	9	6	3
Exit tests (i.e., College Composition I essay exam)	10	15	-5
Graduation rates	11	5	6
Transfer to four-year colleges for graduates	12	9	3
Transfer to four-year colleges for students who have not graduated	13	13	0
Job placement rates	14	3	11
Professional certification exams for students	15	14	1
Capstone courses	16	16	0
Capstone projects	17	17	0
Other (see Appendix, page 11, for a listing of items written in by respondents)			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Academic administrators were also asked to note their years of teaching and administrative experience at HCCC, as well as their total years of college teaching and administration including the years at HCCC. The majority of administrators (67%) have been with HCCC for less than 1 to 4 years. In terms of total college teaching and administrative experience including HCCC, the majority (75%) have 10 or more years of experience. These numbers reflect that, while many HCCC academic administrators have not been with the college for more than a few years, they nevertheless bring a considerable number of years of experience when one takes into account their total years of service in higher education.

Conclusion

The development of the college's Mission Statement over 1992/1993 was of key importance in identifying HCCC's role as a comprehensive urban community college. The self-study process carried out over 1995/1996 for the fall 1997 Middle States accreditation visit and documented in A Comprehensive Self-Study (September 1997) provided the college community with an opportunity to reflect on how effectively its mission was being implemented. This report, documenting the variety of assessment instruments used by faculty and academic administrators, marks the beginning of an ongoing evaluative process that will assist the college in living its mission more effectively as a learning-centered institution.

Appendix

In addition to the list of instruments of assessment provided on the front of the "Current Program and Service Area Assessment Activities" and "Classroom Assessment Activities" surveys, there were two blank items where respondents could fill in other means of assessment. They are shown below.

Academic Administrator Comments

1. Reputation in terms of new recruitments; exit interviews with students at the time they leave college; availability of [feedback from] appropriate program advisement and support (tutoring, etc.).

Full-time Faculty Comments

1. Individual conferences.
2. Reviews/critiques/analyses of movies.
3. Credit given for attending appropriate on-campus and off-campus events.
4. Mental quizzes, miscellaneous creative things, etc.
5. Reading journals; outside assignments; e.g., watch movies/programs & write related summary or do oral presentation; feedback from tutors when needed.
6. Lab work.
7. Homework: Essays/summaries.
8. Student videos (sometimes); computerized dissections.
9. Maps and charting devices.
10. Interviews (written and oral).
11. Video presentations.

Adjunct Faculty Comments

1. Lots of Xeroxed material.
2. Contributions to group publications.
3. Computer projects.
4. Guest speakers.
5. Reviews/critiques/analyses of movies and music.
6. Short answer tests.
7. Psychodrama; dream interpretation; internal visualization sessions --> application of material --> creativity "acting out" [objective: alternative method teaching].
8. Trip to Jersey City Museum; trip to the Old Courthouse.
9. Regarding items 11 and 12 from the Classroom Assessment Activities Survey
   11. Class participation (i.e., class discussions)
   12. Observations of students working in teams:

   These are valid for monitoring instruction and meeting student needs, but these techniques are not valid for grading purposes. They are subjective. Also, student ability to perform is too dependent upon individual differences and styles to be equitable.
10. Field trips.

11. Observations made by students.
12. Notetaking using audiobooks; debates in speech classes.
13. Students' own assessment.
14. Chain conversation; individual demonstration to group; project making.
15. Role playing.
16. One-minute feedback essays.
17. Intercultural e-mail; classroom connections around the world.
18. Attendance.

On the back of each survey there was space for respondents to note comments concerning program and service area assessment. They are shown below.

Academic Administrator Comments

1. With more explanation of terms: "instrument" and "use," and a better understanding of how the results of this survey will be used, perhaps I could have responded more accurately.
2. Answers are based on a variety of degree programs and service areas.
3. We need to have one-on-one interviews with students being admitted to programs to be sure they understand how their needs match program requirements so that they are properly placed at the beginning. Otherwise, they will have to transfer to a different program and will negatively evaluate the first one. We need one-on-one exit interviews for students leaving programs, be it at graduation or transfer to another program or college--statistics alone provide a limited profile.
4. We need a survey of the Hospitality Industry to assess the needs for the implementation of a new degree program in Hospitality Management or Hotel, Restaurant, and Tourism Management.

Full-time Faculty Comments

1. Consider establishing a comprehensive graduation exam.
2. I would like to use more interdisciplinary courses; i.e., between divisions.
3. This questionnaire gave me additional ideas, re: tools to use that I am not yet using.
4. It has been my experience that the exit exams determine the entire grade in English 101. A lot of controversy has arisen over this issue. Perhaps a discussion could be scheduled.
5. Please communicate the plan(s) and the process to faculty so we can comment/participate where appropriate. Exactly how and in what sequence are the programs and services to be assessed?

Adjunct Faculty Comments

1. As a writing instructor, it has been very difficult to schedule my classes in the writing lab. There are two labs adjacent to my classroom, but they are unavailable. It was much easier to schedule computer time in West New York. I have been given a difficult time here in Jersey City.
2. The ESL division would benefit greatly from department exams, an end to social promotions, and the introduction of academic standards. Each course should have a menu of expected outcomes which the students would be required to accomplish. This would put an end to the overly social and non-productive atmosphere at HCCC.
3. The politics and student anxiety surrounding the College Proficiency Test are inordinate in relation to its lack of effectiveness in evaluating student writing. Many students allowed to register for my Eng-101

classes belong in basic or ESL classes. The screening and placement of students at registration leave a lot to be desired.

4. The computer facilities in 26 Journal Square for Introduction to Computers and Computing are drastically outdated. Both hardware and software need to be updated. MS DOS WordPerfect does not serve our students' needs. We need access to the latest integrated software package and access to the Internet and e-mail.
5. The primary objective of Basic Math and Basic Algebra is to pass the exit exam. The content is extensive. If Basic Algebra were six credits, the extra time could be used reinforcing concepts by labs, portfolios, and group work.
6. I wish all my students could do all their writing assignments during classtime on computers. I wish all my students would be given a newspaper of their own to read during classtime. I wish students knew less about their rights and more about their responsibilities. I wish when you write and request duplicate rosters that they get sent to you. College Study Skills class should be the very first class for all students.
7. I like the students and feel that I had a good teaching experience.
8. Any method that has a proven success rate would be considered in my classes.
9. I teach CSC100--Introduction to Computers and Computing, where students are taught basic concepts and given hands-on experience to use some of the commonly used application software. Below are some of the problems faced in the course, and suggestions are:

   For a class of twenty-five, hardly ten to fifteen computers will be in working condition. So it is better if the computers are fixed before the semester starts so that all the students have computers to work with.

   As many of the students are new to computers, they need constant help. In a class of twenty-five students, it is very difficult to render needed help to all the students. As in the past, if lab assistants are provided to the teachers during the lab hours it will be very helpful.

   Today in most of the offices and companies, MS Office is used. But in our college we are teaching the outdated application software. Many students do ask us about this. So if the budget permits, we should upgrade our hardware and software in most of our labs where CSC100 is taught.

10. Use of the term "assessment" is confusing.
11. Upkeep, cleaning, and maintenance of classrooms in the Midlantic Building are unsatisfactory. The four levels of ESL should be coordinated so as to make the full use of expensive textbooks and to provide sequential presentation (especially of grammar) throughout. Instead, textbooks are rarely used beyond half of their content and material is repeated in new texts which students must buy for each level.
12. Suggest some new courses be offered in sociology to determine interest; that classes are broken into two sessions instead of our three-hour session--one cannot pay attention for three hours; that names of professors who teach courses are put with course names so first week of classes isn't about teacher shopping.
13. You need to concentrate more on: teacher prep courses and motivation courses.
14. The microcomputers in rooms 411 and 412 should always be working without a virus. Someone should oversee this at all times.

15. Attendance should be electronically tracked (i.e., scanning sheets). Professors would then have the ability to drop students who do not attend or have erratic attendance. Brookdale has this system.
16. When teachers phone for information to some of their departments, we get an answering machine. No one seems to answer the phone anymore, making it impossible to plan or execute anything different for the class.
17. It would be a helpful idea to provide adjuncts with supplies and some materials needed at Emerson; e.g., TV, VCR, projector, and a copy machine.
18. As an adjunct, I don't have a clue about program and service assessment at HCCC. And that's part of the problem of using adjuncts--we don't know and don't care about anything outside of our classroom.
19. Classes should not be permitted unless there is a minimum of eight students registered.
20. School services should be open at night at least one or two days a week for adjuncts.

Survey:
Classroom Assessment Activities

Effective fall 1997, Hudson County Community College began a five-year process of cyclical reviews of academic programs and service areas. Such reviews, also known as assessment, will provide the College community and the overall community with an understanding of HCCC's academic and service area activities. The following questionnaire is a preliminary step in the cyclical review process. It will provide the College community with the present status of classroom assessment activities at HCCC. The results of this survey will be presented to the Academic Affairs Council in February 1998.

What instruments do you use to assess your students' learning?

A. Please place a check mark (√) in the appropriate column.

You may check more than one column for an item; i.e., Use & Would Use

	At Present		*In the Future*		N/A
	Use	Don't Use	Would Use	Would not Use	for My Course(s)
1. Objective tests/quizzes (true/false, multiple choice, fill-ins, etc.)					
2. Essay tests					
3. Research papers					
4. Lab Reports					
5. Portfolios					
6. Observations of students using equipment and technology					
7. Homework (i.e., text/workbook problems & exercises)					
8. Oral question-and-answer sessions					
9. Writing journals/writing logs/other writing activities					
10. Notebooks					
11. Class participation (i.e., class discussions)					
12. Observations of students working in teams					
13. Reviews/critiques/analyses of books and articles					
14. Externship/internship on-site evaluations					
15. Oral presentations					
16. Other (please indicate item here)_____					
17. Other (please indicate item here)_____					

B. Check (✓) the most appropriate response.

18. What is your teaching status at HCCC? _____Full-time _____Adjunct

19. Total years teaching at HCCC: _____(under) 1-4 _____5-9 _____10+

20. Total years of college teaching: _____(under) 1-4 _____5-9 _____10+
(Including years at HCCC)

21. For what division do you teach?

_____Business & Allied Health _____Culinary Arts _____English, Humanities and Social Sciences

_____English as a Second Language _____Mathematics, Science and Technology

(If you teach a bilingual course, please consider it under the subject area; i.e., bilingual economics = Business & Allied Health)

22. What is your gender? _____Female _____Male

Please feel free to note below any comments or ideas you have concerning program and service area assessment at HCCC.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Kindly return this questionnaire to Fred Taffy at 25 Journal Square by Friday, December 12, 1997.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Survey:
Current Program and Service Area Assessment Activities

Effective fall 1997, Hudson County Community College began a five-year process of cyclical reviews of academic programs and service areas. Such reviews, also known as assessment, will provide the College community and the overall community with an understanding of HCCC's academic and service area activities. The following questionnaire, which has been distributed to academic division administrators and to program coordinators/directors, is a preliminary step in the cyclical review process. It will provide the College community with the present status of program and service area assessment activities at HCCC. The results of this survey will be presented to the Academic Affairs Council in February 1998.

A. What instruments do you use to assess program effectiveness?

Please place a check mark (√) in the appropriate column.

You may check more than one column for an item; i.e., Use & Would Use

	At Present		*In the Future*		N/A
	Use	Don't Use	Would Use	Would not Use	for My Area
1. Student evaluations of faculty					
2. Coordinator/peer evaluations of faculty					
3. Graduation rates					
4. Retention rates					
5. Exit tests (i.e., College Composition I essay exam)					
6. External program accreditation					
7. Employer surveys					
8. Surveys of graduates					
9. Surveys of students					
10. Advisory committee input					
11. Self-studies (not including accreditation processes as in 6 above)					
12. Professional certification exams for students					
13. Transfer to four-year colleges for students who have not graduated					
14. Transfer to four-year colleges for graduates					
15. Job placement rates					
16. Capstone courses					
17. Capstone projects					
18. Other (please indicate item here)_____					
19. Other (please indicate item here)_____					

B. Check (✓) the most appropriate response.

20. Total years of teaching and administration at HCCC: _____(under) 1-4 _____5-9 _____10+

21. Total years of college teaching and administration: _____(under) 1-4 _____5-9 _____10+
(Including years at HCCC)

Please feel free to note below any comments or ideas you have concerning program and service area assessment at HCCC.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Kindly return this questionnaire to Fred Taffy at 25 Journal Square by Friday, December 12, 1997.

Thank you for your cooperation.